EQUISINGULARITY AND EIDS

TERENCE GAFFNEY AND MARIA APARECIDA RUAS

Abstract. We continue the study of the equisingularity of determinantal singularities for essentially isolated singularities (EIDS).These singularities are generic except at isolated points.

arXiv:1602.00362v1 [math.CV] 1 Feb 2016

1. Introduction

In this paper we continue the search for necessary and sufficient invariants for the Whitney equisingularity of a family of spaces, and related conditions such as the A_f and Wf condition. In the study of equisingularity of sets we are given a family of sets (or mappings) and we want to find invariants which depend only on the members of the family, whose independence of parameter ensures that an equisingularity condition holds. Successful examples include hypersurfaces ([16]) and complete intersections with isolated singularities ([9]). The attempt to extend these results to smoothable determinantal singularities led to the introduction of the notion of the landscape of a singularity.

Choosing the landscape of a singularity X consists of defining the allowable families that include the set, and its generic perturbations. Each set should have a unique generic element that it deforms to. There should exist a connection between invariants related to the infinitesimal geometry of X, and some elements of the topology of this generic element. Describing the connection between the infinitesimal geometry of X and the topology of the generic element related to X is part of understanding the landscape.

In studying the equisingularity of a family of isolated singularities, choosing the landscape can be done by fixing in advance a component of the base space of the versal deformation, from which the given family is induced. This can be done explicitly or implicitly as in [12] where we restrict to determinantal deformations. This has the effect of fixing the generic fiber of the versal deformation to which all members of our family can be deformed. Invariants associated with the geometry/topology of this general member provide important information about the singularities in the original family.

In [12] there is an example of a singularity for which there are two different choices of landscape. In the example, for each choice of landscape there is a Whitney equisingular family which contains X. The invariants of X which control the Whitney equisingularity of the family depend on the choice of landscape. Each choice of landscape gives a different generic object to which X deforms, and their differing topology accounts for the differing infinitesimal invariants.

In this paper we extend the framework of [12] to the simplest non-smoothable and non-isolated singularities– the essentially isolated determinantal singularities (EIDS). These were introduced as an object of study by Ebeling and Gusein-Zade in [4].

A determinantal singularity $X^d \subset \mathbb{C}^q$ is defined by the minors of a matrix M_X whose entries are elements of $\mathcal{O}_q$, where d the dimension of X is the expected dimension for the order of the chosen minors. Thus, a determinant singularity X, with presentation matrix M_X, can be viewed as the intersection of the graph of M_X, seen as a map from $\mathbb{C}^q$ to $Hom(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C}^{n+k})$, with $\mathbb{C}^q \times \overline{\Sigma}_r$, where $\overline{\Sigma}_r$, the matrices in $Hom(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C}^{n+k})$ of kernel rank r or more. A determinantal singularity is an EIDS, if M_X is transverse to the rank stratification except possibly at the origin. This is discussed in greater detail in the next section.

Here is the framework we extend to this case. The equisingularity conditions of interest are concerned with limits of hyperplanes; these are studied by a modification of the family of spaces; the failure of the equisingularity condition is equivalent to the fiber of the modification being larger than expected. The

T. Gaffney was partially supported by PVE-CNPq Proc. 401565/2014-9.
M.A. Ruas was partially supported by FAPESP Proc. 2014/00304-2 and CNPq Proc. 305651/2011-0 .

modifications are spaces associated with modules. The existence of large dimensional fibers in the modification is equivalent to the non-emptiness of the polar variety of the module. This part of the framework was introduced in [11].

The choice of landscape provides a measure of the singularity of the member of a family. Different specializations of the generic element of the landscape to the members of the family are possible. These different specializations leave infinitesimal traces in the form of large dimensional fibers in the conormal modification of the family of sets. The invariant $m_d(X)$ defined below measures the vanishing topology in the smoothing, and is related to the polar varieties of the relative Jacobian module of the family. Its independence from parameter is equivalent to the emptiness of the polar variety of the Jacobian module.

The invariant $m_d(X)$, through the theory of the multiplicity of pairs of modules, can be related to invariants related to the infinitesimal geometry of the singularity. We do this in 2.15. This allows us to compute the invariant in terms of the presentation matrix of X independent of the family X is member of.

The information that we need about the topology of the generic fiber in order to give a topological interpretation of $m_d(X)$ is already contained in [4]. We summarize the needed information in 2.6.

These two steps, the relation of $m_d(X)$ to the topology of the generic element, and its calculation in terms of infinitesimal invariants were introduced into the framework in [12].

In this paper the sets under consideration have non-isolated singularities in general. The cleanest statement about the topological interpretation of the polar invariants, and the Whitney equisingularity of the family of sets comes from considering all of the strata at once. These appear in 2.7 and 2.17, which gives a necessary and sufficient criterion for the Whitney equisingularity of families of essentially isolated determinantal singularities (EIDS). We give an application of our results to the characterization of generic hyperplanes using our invariants. We also give an example of our theorems, which is of independent interest for what it shows about the multiplicity of a pair of modules in the determinantal setting.

These results justify the landscape point of view and the usefulness of the machinery developed in [11] and added to in [12].

2. Invariants Infinitesimal and Topological

We start with some notation.

Given the germ of an analytic set X let X_0 denote the smooth points of X. A determinantal variety X (of type $(n+k,n,t)$) in an open domain $U \subset \mathbb{C}^q$ is a variety of dimension $d := q-(n-t+1)(n+k-t+1)$ defined by the condition $\operatorname{rk} M(x) < t$ where $t \leq n$, $M(x) = (f_{ij}(x))$ is an $(n+k)\times n$-matrix ($i = 1,\ldots,n+k$, $j = 1,\ldots,n$), whose entries $f_{ij}(x)$ are complex analytic functions on U. In other words, X is defined by the equations $m^t_{IJ}(x) = 0$ for all subsets $I \subset \{1,\ldots,n+k\}$, $J \subset \{1,\ldots,n\}$ with t elements, where $m^t_{IJ}(x)$ is the corresponding $t\times t$-minor of the matrix $M(x)$.

This definition can be reformulated in the following way. We can view M as a map to $\operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^n,\mathbb{C}^{n+k})$, and let Σ^t be the subset of $\operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^n,\mathbb{C}^{n+k})$ consisting of linear maps of rank less than t. The variety Σ^t has codimension $(n+k-t+1)(n-t+1)$ in $\operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^n,\mathbb{C}^{n+k})$.

The representation of the variety Σ^t as the union of $\Sigma^i \setminus \Sigma^{i-1}$, $i = 1,\ldots,t$, is a stratification of Σ_t, which is locally holomorphically trivial. The determinantal variety ${}_tX$ is the preimage $M^{-1}(\Sigma^t)$ of the variety Σ^t (subject to the condition that $\operatorname{codim}{}_tX = \operatorname{codim}\Sigma^t$). For $1 \leq i \leq t$, let ${}_iX = M^{-1}(\Sigma^i)$. If $X =_i X$ then we drop i from the notation.

All X have an associated fixed presentation matrix, M_X. (We suppress X from the notation if it is understood.) Allowable deformations of X arise from deformations of the entries of M so the format of M also determines the allowable first order infinitesimal deformations.

If M is transverse to the rank stratification of $\operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^n,\mathbb{C}^{n+k})$ for $x \neq 0$, then the germ of X at a singular point is holomorphic to either the product of Σ^t with an affine space or a transverse slice of Σ^t . This inspires the following definition ([4]):

Definition 2.1. *A point $x \in X = M^{-1}(\Sigma^t)$ is called essentially non-singular if, at the point x, the map M is transversal to the corresponding stratum of the variety Σ^t.*

Making an analogy with singularities of maps, the germs of determinantal singularities at essentially non-singular points correspond to stable germs; in singularities of maps the germs which are stable except at the origin are the finitely determined germs, and they have many nice properties. The analogous object in this setting is:

Definition 2.2. *A germ $(X,0) \subset (\mathbb{C}^q,0)$ of a determinantal variety of type $(n+k,n,t)$ has an* isolated essentially singular point *at the origin (or is an essentially isolated determinantal singularity: EIDS) if it has only essentially non-singular points in a punctured neighborhood of the origin in X.*

Any ICIS is an example of an EIDS. If X is an EIDS then it has a well defined stabilization, gotten by deforming M to make it transverse to the strata of $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^n,\mathbb{C}^{n+k})$. If an EIDS has an isolated singularity, we call it an IDS.

We will consider families of EIDS; families are denoted by $\mathcal{X}$.

The elements in the preceding paragraphs make up the landscape for an EIDS. These elements consist of a set of allowable families which include the set and the generic elements that appear in allowable families. The stabilization is the unique generic element that an EIDS deforms to. The first order infinitesimal deformations of our sets are determined by the allowable deformations and form a module which we denote by $N(X)$. Describing the connection between the infinitesimal geometry of X and the topology of the generic element related to X is our first goal, and is an important part of understanding the landscape.

If we are studying the Whitney equisingularity of a family we denote the parameter space by Y and assume Y is embedded in $\mathcal{X}$ as linear subspace. For simplicity of exposition we impose a condition on our families which we hope to remove in later versions.

Definition 2.3. *A s-parameter family $\mathcal{X}$ of EIDS is good if there exists a neighborhood U of Y such that $M_{\mathcal{X}(y)}$ is transverse to the rank stratification off the origin for all $y \in U$.*

This condition enables us to prove:

Proposition 2.4. *Suppose ${}_t\mathcal{X}$ is a good family of EIDS with representation matrix M. Then $\{{}_i\mathcal{X} \setminus Y\}$, $i = 1,\ldots,t$ is a locally analytically trivial stratification of $\mathcal{X} \setminus Y$.*

Proof. From the definition of good family for i, $\{{}_i\mathcal{X} \setminus Y\}$ is smooth, since $M_{\mathcal{X}}$ is transverse to the rank stratification. That the strata are locally analytically trivial follows because the Σ^i are and M is transverse to these. □

The good condition implies that in a s-parameter family, no set of points from ${}_i\mathcal{X}$ can split off from the origin if the expected dimension of ${}_i\mathcal{X}$ is less than s. It also implies that there cannot be subsets of points where $\{{}_i\mathcal{X} \setminus Y\}$ is singular which include the origin in their closure even if the expected dimension of $\{{}_i\mathcal{X}\}$ is greater than or equal to s.

Now we introduce the invariants we will use.

The invariant $m_d(X^d)$ was introduced in [8] for the study of ICIS singularities, and for isolated singularities whose versal deformations have a smooth base in [11]. It was recently used in [12], [14] and [15] to study a smoothable IDS. In the IDS context, it is the number of critical points that a generic linear form has when restricted to the generic fiber in a smoothing $\mathcal{X}$ of X. It is also the multiplicity of the polar curve of $JM_z(\mathcal{X})$ over the parameter space at the origin.

In the EIDS context, instead of a smoothing, we have a stabilization–a determinantal deformation of X to the generic fiber. (Sometimes we refer to the generic fiber as the stabilization as well.)Then the multiplicity of the polar curve of $JM_z(\mathcal{X})$ over the parameter space at the origin in a stabilization is the number of critical points that a generic linear form has on the complement of the singular set on a generic fiber. Call this number $m_d(X^d)$. If $X = \cup_i X$, for $1 \leq i \leq t$, then it makes sense to consider $m_{d_i}({}_iX)$ where d_i is the dimension of ${}_iX$, and the expected dimension of ${}_iX$ is greater than 0. If the expected dimension ${}_iX$ is zero, we define $m_0({}_iX)$ to be the colength of the ideal defining ${}_iX$. As the next lemma shows, $m_0({}_iX)$ is the number of points of type ${}_iX$ on a generic fiber of the stabilization.

Proposition 2.5. *Suppose X is a determinantal variety, and ${}_iX$ has expected dimension 0. Then $m_0({}_iX)$ is the number of points of type ${}_iX$ on a generic fiber of the stabilization of X.*

Proof. In a stabilization $\mathcal{X}$ of X, ${}_i\mathcal{X}$ is a determinantal variety, hence Cohen-Macaulay. Consider the projection π of ${}_i\mathcal{X}$ to the base Y^1, where y is the coordinate on the base. Then the degree of π restricted to ${}_i\mathcal{X}$ is the multiplicity of $(y \circ \pi)$ in the local ring of ${}_i\mathcal{X}$ at the origin. Since ${}_i\mathcal{X}$ is Cohen-Macaulay, this multiplicity is just the dimension of the ring mod $(y \circ \pi)$, in turn this is just the colength of the ideal defining ${}_iX$. □

The invariant $m_d(X^d)$ for an EIDS as we have defined it appears in [4] as the specialization of Poincaré-Hopf-Nash index of a differential 1-form ω denoted $\mathrm{ind}_{\mathrm{PHN}}\,\omega$. The invariant $m_d(X^d)$ is $\mathrm{ind}_{\mathrm{PHN}}\,dl$, l a generic linear form.

In the same paper there is a formula relating the radial index of a differential form ω and the $\mathrm{ind}_{\mathrm{PHN}}\,\omega$.

Proposition 2.6. (Ebeling, Gusein-Zade) *One has*

$$\mathrm{ind}_{\mathrm{rad}}\,(\omega, X, 0) = \sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{t} n_{it}\mathrm{ind}_{\mathrm{PHN}}\,(\omega, {}_iX, 0) + (-1)^{\dim X - 1}\overline{\chi}(X, 0).$$

In the above formula $\overline{\chi}(X, 0)$ is the reduced Euler characteristic of $\widetilde{X}$, the stabilization of X. The integers n_{it} are given by the formulas $n_{it} = (-1)^{(k)(t-i)}\binom{n-i}{n-t}$. Further, if $\omega = dl$, l a generic linear form, then $\mathrm{ind}_{\mathrm{rad}}\,(dl, X, 0) = (-1)^{d-1}\overline{\chi}(\widetilde{X \cap H})$, $H = l^{-1}(\epsilon)$ for ϵ sufficiently small ([3], Theorem 3). This invariant does not depend on the generic hyperplane H or on the stabilization of the determinantal section $X \cap H$, so we simply write $\mathrm{ind}_{\mathrm{rad}}\,(dl, X, 0) = (-1)^{d-1}\overline{\chi}(X \cap H)$.

Assuming $X = {}_tX$, we can re-write this formula using dl for ω and $m_{d_i}({}_iX)$ for $\mathrm{ind}_{\mathrm{PHN}}\,(dl, {}_iX, 0)$, apply it to each stratum in turn getting:

$$(-1)^{\dim X}\chi(X, 0) + (-1)^{dim X - 1}\chi(X \cap H, 0) = \sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{t} n_{it} m_{\dim\,{}_iX}({}_iX, 0)$$

$$(-1)^{\dim\,{}_{t-1}X}\chi({}_{t-1}X, 0) + (-1)^{dim_{t-1}X - 1}\chi({}_{t-1}X \cap H, 0) = \sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{t-1} n_{i(t-1)} m_{\dim\,{}_iX}({}_iX, 0)$$

$$\cdots$$

$$(-1)^{\dim\,{}_1X}\chi({}_1X, 0) + (-1)^{dim_1X - 1}\chi({}_1X \cap H, 0) = m_{\dim\,{}_1X}({}_1X).$$

The context is important in thinking about these equations. The lowest dimensional stratum appearing in X whose expected codimension is less than or equal to q, the dimension of the embedding space, is the stratum of the last equation. The others equations are dropped. The last equation always has a single term on the right hand side, because the stabilization is a smoothing in this case. For, if the codimension of the last stratum is less than q, then this is true of the stabilization as well, so the stabilization is smooth. If the codimension is q, then the stabilization consists of a finite set of points. If the last equation corresponds to a stratum of dimension zero, then both sides of the last equation have only 1 term, and the right hand side is the colength of an ideal as explained above.

Proposition 2.7. *In a family of EIDS the $m_{\dim\,{}_iX}({}_iX, 0)$ are constant for all i if and only if*

$$(-1)^{\dim\,{}_iX}\chi({}_iX, 0) + (-1)^{dim_iX - 1}\chi({}_iX, 0)$$

are constant for all i.

Proof. This is obvious from the structure of the equations. □

The last proof makes a connection between the 0-dimensional polar multiplicities of the ${}_iX$ and the topology of their stabilizations. This is half of the picture that we want. Now we develop the connection between the 0-dimensional polar multiplicities and infinitesimal invariants of the ${}_iX$, constructed from modules associated to them.

These invariants are closely related to the theory of integral closure of modules, which we briefly review.

Let (X,x) be a germ of a complex analytic space and X a small representative of the germ, and let $\mathcal{O}_X$ denote the structure sheaf on a complex analytic space X. For simplicity we assume X is equidimensional, and if M is a sheaf of modules on X, M a subsheaf of a free sheaf F, then g is the generic rank of M on each component of X. If we fix a set of generators of a module M, then we write $[M]$ for the matrix of generators.

Definition 2.8. *Suppose (X,x) is the germ of a complex analytic space, M a submodule of $\mathcal{O}^p_{X,x}$. Then $h \in \mathcal{O}^p_{X,x}$ is in the integral closure of M, denoted $\overline{M}$, if for all analytic $\phi : (\mathbb{C},0) \to (X,x)$, $h \circ \phi \in (\phi^* M)\mathcal{O}_1$. If M is a submodule of N and $\overline{M} = \overline{N}$ we say that M is a reduction of N.*

To check the definition it suffices to check along a finite number of curves whose generic point is in the Zariski open subset of X along which M has maximal rank. (Cf. [9].)

If a module M has finite colength in $\mathcal{O}^p_{X,x}$, it is possible to attach a number to the module, its Buchsbaum-Rim multiplicity, $e(M, \mathcal{O}^p_{X,x})$. We can also define the multiplicity $e(M,N)$ of a pair of modules $M \subset N$, M of finite colength in N, as well, even if N does not have finite colength in $\mathcal{O}^p_X$. We refer to [11] for the definition of multiplicity of pairs of modules.

One of our invariants will be the multiplicity of the pair $(JM({}_iX), N({}_iX))$, where $JM({}_iX)$ is the Jacobian module and $N({}_iX)$ is the module of infinitesimal first order deformations of ${}_iX$, induced from the first order deformations of the presentation matrix of X. We must show that $(JM({}_iX), N({}_iX))$ is well-defined for EIDS.

We will do this by showing that the transversality of M to the strata of $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C}^{n+k})$ off the origin implies that off the origin the two modules agree. To do this we use the holomorphic triviality of the stratification of $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C}^{n+k})$. To show that the multiplicity is well defined, it is actually enough to have a Whitney stratification, so we treat this case as well in the next lemmas.

We first work on the target, then on the source. Recall that if (S,x) is the germ of a submanifold at x, then a direct transversal to S at x is a plane T of dimension complementary to S which is transverse to S. Given such a plane T, we may make a change of coordinates so that the ambient space is holomorphic to $T \times S$. In this coordinate system we denote by $JM(X)_T$, the submodule of $JM(X)$ generated by the partial derivatives of the defining functions with respect to a basis of T.

Lemma 2.9. *Let X be a stratified subset of $(\mathbb{C}^N, x)$.*

i) *Suppose X has a locally holomorphically trivial stratification. Let S_x denote the stratum containing x. Suppose T is a direct transversal to S at x. Then $JM(X) \subset JM(X)_T$.*

ii) *Suppose the stratification is a Whitney stratification, and Let S_x denote the stratum containing x. Suppose T is a direct transversal to S at x. Then $JM(X) \subset \overline{JM(X)_T}$.*

Proof. i) Choose local coordinates so that the ambient space is holomorphic to $S_x \times T$, and $X = F^{-1}(0)$. Since S_x is a stratum in a holomorphically trivial stratification, with trivialization of form $(s, r(s,t))$, $r(s,0) = (0)$, for all i, $\frac{\partial}{\partial s_i}$ lifts to a holomorphic field ξ tangent to every stratum of X, $\xi = \frac{\partial}{\partial s_i} + \sum h_j(s,t)\frac{\partial}{\partial t_j}$, $h_j(s,t) \in m_S$. This implies that $DF(\xi) = 0$, hence, $\frac{\partial F}{\partial s_i} = -\sum h_j(s,t)\frac{\partial F}{\partial t_j}$, hence $JM(X)_S \subset m_S JM(X)_T$.

ii) Since S_x is a stratum in a Whitney stratification, it is known ([9]) that $JM(X)_S \subset \overline{m_S JM(X)_T}$, from which the result follows.

□

Lemma 2.10. *Suppose $M : (\mathbb{C}^q, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}^N, x)$, $x \in X$, X a stratified subset of $(\mathbb{C}^N, x)$.*

i) *Suppose X has a Whitney stratification. Let S_x denote the stratum containing x. Suppose M is transverse to S_x at x. Let X_M denote $M^{-1}(X)$. Then $M^*(JM(X)) \subset \overline{JM(X_M)}$.*

ii) *Suppose X has a locally holomorphically trivial stratification. Let S_x denote the stratum containing x. Suppose M is transverse to S_x at x. Let X_M denote $M^{-1}(X)$. Then $M^*(JM(X)) \subset JM(X_M)$.*

Proof. i) Since M is transverse to S_x at x, there is a linear space T_M of $\mathbb{C}^q$, whose image under DM is a direct transversal to S_x at x, $DM(0)$ injective on T_M. We assume coordinates on the target chosen to fit with the previous lemma and coordinates on the source so that $\mathbb{C}^q$ is the product of T_M and a direct transversal A,

the $DM(0)$ takes T_M to T in these coordinates, z coordinates on T_M, y' coordinates on A. Let the G be the map defining X, so that $G \circ M$ defines X_M. Let $\phi : \mathbb{C}, 0 \to X_M, x$ be a curve. By the chain rule $JM(X_M)$ is a submodule of $M^*JM(X)$. The generators of $JM(X_M)$, when composed with ϕ, by the chain rule and choice of coordinates are

$$\{\frac{\partial(G \circ M)}{\partial z_i} \circ \phi = \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_i} \circ M \circ \phi\} \mod m_1\phi^*M^*JM(X)$$

as the other partial derivatives of $G \circ M$ are $0 \mod m_1\phi^*M^*JM(X)$. Since $\frac{\partial G}{\partial z_i}$ pull back to generators of $\phi^*M^*(JM(X))$ on the curve $M \circ \phi$ by the previous lemma, by Nakayma's lemma the $\{\frac{\partial(G\circ M)}{\partial z_i} \circ \phi\}$ generate $\phi^*M^*(JM(X))$ as well. Hence, $M^*(JM(X)) \subset \overline{JM(X_M)}$ by the curve criterion.

The proof of ii) is even easier. We again use the chain rule and local coordinates, this time applying Nakayama's lemma to $\{\frac{\partial(G\circ M)}{\partial z_i}\}$ and $M^*JM(X)$.

□

Proposition 2.11. *Let $M\colon \mathbb{C}^q \to \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C}^{n+k})$, $X = M^{-1}(\Sigma^i)$, M transverse to Σ^i at the origin. Then $JM(X) = M^*(N(\Sigma^i)) = N(X)$.*

Proof. Since the stratification of $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C}^{n+k})$ by rank is homomorphically trivial, by the last proposition we know that $JM(X) = M^*(JM(\Sigma^i))$. Since N is stable and universal, we have

$$JM(X) = M^*(N(\Sigma^i)) = N(X).$$

□

Corollary 2.12. *Suppose (X, x) is an EIDS, then $e(JM(X), N(X))$ is defined.*

Proof. Since X is an EIDS, M is transverse to $\{\Sigma^j\}$ in a deleted neighborhood of the origin. Hence, in a deleted neighborhood of the origin, $JM(X) = N(X)$ by the previous proposition. Therefore, since the modules agree on a deleted neighborhood, the multiplicity of the pair is well defined ([13]). □

Remark 2.13. *In the event that a set X has only a Whitney stratification, and M is a map which is transverse to the stratification except at the origin, then the previous couple of propositions still show that the multiplicity of the pair is well defined, provided N, the module of allowable infinitesimal deformations in our landscape, is universal and stable.*

At this point we pause to prove a useful result about certain EIDS. We say an EIDS is stably isolated if its stabilization has only isolated singularities. If $X = M^{-1}(\Sigma_i)$, $M\colon \mathbb{C}^q \to \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C}^{n+k})$ then X is stably isolated if its stabilization $X(y)$ contains isolated points in ${}_{i+1}X(y)$. This can happen only if $q = \mathrm{codim}\ \Sigma_{i+1}$. These singularities are useful test cases for invariants which are defined for isolated singularities. A "good" invariant should be zero at a point of X, if the dimension of the fiber of the conormal of X is less than or equal to the dimension of the conormal less two. We give a formula for the dimension of the fiber of the conormal of the stabilization of a stably isolated singularity at a singular point, showing that this bound always holds.

Proposition 2.14. *Let $M\colon \mathbb{C}^q \to \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C}^{n+k})$, $X = M^{-1}(\Sigma_i)$, M transverse to Σ_{i+1} at the origin, $M(0) \in \Sigma_{i+1}$, 0 an isolated point of $M^{-1}(\Sigma_{i+1})$, then the difference between the dimension of $C(X)$ and the dimension of the fiber of $C(X)$ at 0 is $k+1$.*

Proof. The assumptions imply that $M(\mathbb{C}^q)$ is a direct transversal to Σ_{i+1}, so we can assume coordinates chosen as in 2.9, with a local trivialization. The existence of the trivialization implies that Σ_i and $C(\Sigma_i)$ are locally trivial along Σ_{i+1} and the fiber of $C(\Sigma_i)$ over $M(0)$ in this trivialization is determined by the tangent hyperplanes to the fiber of Σ_i over $M(0)$. By choice of trivialization this fiber is isomorphic to X. The local trivialization also implies that every tangent hyperplane to Σ_i at points on X contains the tangent space T to Σ_{i+1} at $M(0)$. This gives a bijective map between $C(X)$ and the fiber of $C(\Sigma_i)$ over $M(0)$, by taking a point (x, H) of $C(X)$ and mapping it to $(x, H \oplus T)$.

So, it suffices to compute the dimension of the fiber of $p\colon C(\Sigma_i) \to \Sigma_i$ over $M(0)$. This will be the dimension of the fiber of $C(X)$ over 0. In [12], this fiber was computed. We describe the result.

Given $M \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C}^{n+k})$, let $K(M)$ denote the kernel of M and $C(M)$ the cokernel. Let $\Sigma_r(M)$ denote the elements of $Hom(K(M), C(M))$ of kernel rank r. Denote $\mathbb{P}(\overline{\Sigma}_r(M))$ by $X_r(M)$. We suppose M is in Σ_s, $s > r$; then the result of [12] is that the fiber of the conormal of $C(\overline{\Sigma}_r)$ at M is $X_{s-r}(M)$.

In the case at hand $s - r = 1$, so the dimension of the fiber of $C(X)$ over 0 is $\dim X_1(M(0))$. Since $\dim K(M) = i + 1$ and $\dim C(M) = k + i + 1$, the codimension of $\Sigma_1(M)$ in $Hom(K(M), C(M))$ is $k + 1$.

Now we have :

$$\begin{aligned}\dim C(X) - \dim (C(X)(0)) &= (q-1) - \dim X_1(M(0)) \\ &= q - \dim \Sigma_1(M(0)).\end{aligned}$$

Since $q = \dim Hom(K(M), C(M))$, we have

$$\dim C(X) - \dim (C(X)(0)) = k + 1.$$

□

Returning to our main line of development, the other invariant we need is $M(\mathbb{C}^q) \cdot \Gamma_d(\Sigma^i)$, where d is the dimension of $M^{-1}(\Sigma^i)$, and $\Gamma_d(\Sigma^i)$ is the codimension d polar variety of Σ^i. This invariant is an intersection number. Consider the graph of M in $\mathbb{C}^q \times \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C}^{n+k})$, then $M(\mathbb{C}^q) \cdot \Gamma_d(\Sigma^i)$ is the intersection of the graph with $\mathbb{C}^q \times \Gamma_d(\Sigma^i)$, where $\Gamma_d(\Sigma^i)$ has codimension d in Σ^i. (Of course, this implies $\Gamma_d(\Sigma^i)$ has codimension q in $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C}^{n+k})$.)

Notice that if $q \geq n(n+k)$ then $\Gamma_d(\Sigma^i)$ must be empty, so the intersection number is 0. If $n = 2, k = 1$, then this is true for all ${}_2X$, for $q \geq 6$. (In fact, it is true in this case for $q \geq 5$.)

Now we connect our infinitesimal invariants with the polar invariants.

Proposition 2.15. *Suppose $\mathcal{X}$ is a one parameter stabilization of an EIDS ${}_iX^d$ then*

$$e(JM(X), N(X)) + M(\mathbb{C}^q) \cdot \Gamma_d(\Sigma^i) = m_d(X).$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{M}$ be the map from $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^q \to \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C}^{n+k})$ which defines $\mathcal{X}$. We can arrange for $\tilde{M}$ and $\Gamma_d(\Sigma^i)$ to be transverse. Then $M(\mathbb{C}^q) \cdot \Gamma_d(\Sigma^i)$ is the number of points in which $\tilde{M}(y)$ intersects $\Gamma_d(\Sigma^i)$. In turn, this is the multiplicity over $\mathbb{C}$ of $\Gamma_d(N(\mathcal{X}))$ at the origin, as $\tilde{M}^{-1}(\Gamma_d(\Sigma^i)) = \Gamma_d(N(\mathcal{X}))$. Now we apply the multiplicity polar theorem to $JM_z(\mathcal{X})$ and $N(\mathcal{X})$ we get:

$$e(JM(X), N(X)) + mult_C \Gamma_d(N(\mathcal{X})) = mult_C \Gamma_d(JM_z(\mathcal{X})) = m_d(X).$$

which gives the result. Notice that we used the universality of N to identify $N(X)$ with $N(\mathcal{X})(0)$. □

We can now complete the link between our infinitesimal invariants and our topological invariants. In the following corollary, we adopt the convention that if the expected dimension of a singularity type is 0 for X, we use the colength of the ideal defining the singularity type.

Corollary 2.16. *For an EIDS X,*

$$(-1)^{\dim X}\chi(X, 0) + (-1)^{dim X - 1}\chi(\widetilde{X \cap H}, 0) = \sum_{i=1}^{t} n_{it}(e(JM({}_iX^{d_i}), N({}_iX^{d_i})) + M(\mathbb{C}^q) \cdot \Gamma_{d(i)}(\Sigma^i)).$$

Further, in a family of EIDS $\mathcal{X}$, the invariants $e(JM({}_i\mathcal{X}(y)^{d_i}), N({}_i\mathcal{X}(i)^{d_i})) + \tilde{M}(y)(\mathbb{C}^q) \cdot \Gamma_{d(i)}(\Sigma^i)$ are independent of y iff the invariants

$(-1)^{\dim {}_i\mathcal{X}(y)}\chi({}_i\mathcal{X}(y), 0) + (-1)^{dim_i \mathcal{X}(y) - 1}\chi(\widetilde{{}_iX \cap H}(y), 0)$ *are independent of y for all i.*

The intersection numbers $M(\mathbb{C}^q) \cdot \Gamma_d(\Sigma^i)$ depend only on the presentation matrix M. In the case of Σ^n, this number has been computed in terms of the entries of M in [12].

Now we connect our results with Whitney equisingularity.

Theorem 2.17. *Suppose $\mathcal{X}^{d+k}$ is a good k-dimensional family of EIDS. Then the family is Whitney equisingular if and only if the invariants $e(m_Y JM({}_i\mathcal{X}(y)), N({}_i\mathcal{X}(y))) + \tilde{M}(y)(\mathbb{C}^q) \cdot \Gamma_{d(i)}(\Sigma^i)$ are independent of y.*

Proof. Since the family is good we only need to control the pairs of strata (V, Y), V some stratum in the canonical stratification of $\mathcal{X} - Y$. From the good hypothesis we know all strata (except perhaps Y have the expected dimension, and the types of dimension zero are controlled by the colength of the defining ideals. To show the positive dimensional strata are Whitney over Y, we apply the multiplicity polar theorem ([10]). The Whitney conditions hold for the open stratum of our singularity, provided the fiber of the blow-up of the conormal modification by m_Y is equidimensional over Y. This occurs if and only the polar variety of codimension d of $JM_z(\mathcal{X})$ is empty. The independence of our invariants from y hold if and only if this polar is empty.

□

Corollary 2.18. *Suppose $\mathcal{X}^{d+k}$ is a good k-dimensional family of EIDS. Then the family is Whitney equisingular if and only if the polar multiplicities at the origin of ${}_i\mathcal{X}(y)$ and the invariants*

$$e(JM({}_i\mathcal{X}(y)), N({}_i\mathcal{X}(y)) + \tilde{M}(y)(\mathbb{C}^q) \cdot \Gamma_{d(i)}(\Sigma^i)$$

are independent of y.

Proof. There is an expansion formula for $e(m_Y JM({}_i\mathcal{X}(y)), N({}_i\mathcal{X}(y))$ as a sum of terms with the polar multiplicities of ${}_i\mathcal{X}(y)$ with combinatorial coefficients, and the term $e(JM({}_i\mathcal{X}(y)), N({}_i\mathcal{X}(y)))$. So Whitney implies the polar multiplicities are constant, and $e(m_Y JM({}_i\mathcal{X}(y)), N({}_i\mathcal{X}(y)) + \tilde{M}(y)(\mathbb{C}^q) \cdot \Gamma_{d(i)}(\Sigma^i)$ are constant. So the terms $e(JM({}_i\mathcal{X}(y)), N({}_i\mathcal{X}(y)) + \tilde{M}(y)(\mathbb{C}^q) \cdot \Gamma_{d(i)}(\Sigma^i)$ are independent of y as well. The other direction is clear. □

The study of plane sections of a family of singularities has been a constant theme in the theory of Whitney equisingularity going back to the early work of Teissier [16]. Here as an application of the preceding material, we give a numerical condition for a limiting tangent hyperplane to be generic hyperplane, and relate this condition to the topology of the sections of an EIDS.

We say a hyperplane is a *generic* hyperplane for X, x if it is not a limit of tangent hyperplanes to the smooth part of X at x. A hyperplane H is stratified generic for X, x, if X, x has a stratification with strata $\{S_i\}$ and H is generic for all S_i. In general this notion depends on the stratification; adding additional strata results in fewer planes being generic. However, for an EIDS X, we have a canonical stratification of X given by the ${}_iX$, so when we talk about H being stratified generic for X, it is always with this stratification in mind.

Using modules, we can give an integral closure description of when a hyperplane is generic for X and when it is stratified generic. Recall given a pair of modules $M \subset N$, M is a reduction of N if and only if $\overline{M} = \overline{N}$.

Proposition 2.19. *Given an EIDS X, and a hyperplane H, H is generic for X provided $JM(X)_H$ is a reduction of $JM(X)$. Therefore, H is stratified generic for X provided $JM(i_X)_H$ is a reduction of $JM(i_X)$ for all i for which i_X has positive dimension.*

Proof. Cf. [7] □

This gives easily the following numerical criterion for a hyperplane to be generic or stratified generic.

Proposition 2.20. *Given an EIDS X, and a hyperplane H, H is generic for X, if and only if*

$$e(JM(X)_H, N(X)) = e(JM(X), N(X)),$$

and H is stratified generic if

$$e(JM({}_iX)_H, N({}_iX)) = e(JM({}_iX), N({}_iX)).$$

Proof. We have the multiplicity of pairs of modules is additive (Cf. KT); hence for all i,

$$e(JM({}_iX)_H, N({}_iX)) = e(JM({}_iX), N({}_iX)) + e(JM({}_iX)_H, JM({}_iX)).$$

Then

$$e(JM({}_iX)_H, N({}_iX)) = e(JM({}_iX), N({}_iX))$$

if and only if $e(JM({}_iX)_H, JM({}_iX)) = 0$. Since all of the ${}_iX$ are equidimensional, this holds if and only if $JM(i_X)_H$ is a reduction of $JM(i_X)$ for all i (Cf. KT). □

The additivity result also shows that for any hyperplane H for which the multiplicities are defined, $e(JM({}_iX)_H, N({}_iX)) \geq e(JM({}_iX), N({}_iX))$, so that the stratified generic hyperplanes minimize these multiplicities.

At this point we have two sets of generic hyperplanes. Those which are stratified generic, and those which give the the generic plane sections whose Euler characteristic appears in 2.16. We show that those which are stratified generic give generic plane sections for all of the formulas of type 2.16, establishing a minimality result in terms of the topology of these sections. We say that a hyperplane H is *topologically minimal* for an EIDS X, if for all i such that ${}_iX$ has positive dimension, $(-1)^{dim_i X-1}\chi(\widetilde{{}_iX \cap H}, 0)$ is minimal among all hyperplanes H.

Proposition 2.21. *Let X be an EIDS singularity. Then H is stratified generic for X if and only if H is topologically minimal for X.*

Proof. It follows from 2.16 and the last proposition that H is stratified generic for X if and only if

$$(-1)^{\dim {}_jX}\chi({}_jX, 0) + (-1)^{dim_j X-1}\chi(\widetilde{{}_jX \cap H}, 0) = \sum_{i=1}^{t_j} n_{it_j}(e(JM({}_iX^{d_i})_H, N({}_iX^{d_i})) + M(\mathbb{C}^q) \cdot \Gamma_{d(i)}(\Sigma^i)).$$

Further, if H is not stratified generic, then the right sides are greater than or equal to the left hand side, and for at least one formula the inequality is strict. Since the term $(-1)^{\dim {}_jX}\chi({}_jX, 0)$ appears in the formulae independently of H, the terms $(-1)^{dim_j X-1}\chi(\widetilde{{}_jX \cap H}, 0)$ must be minimal for H stratified generic. □

This result recovers and extends the results of [1].

Proposition 2.22. *Let X be an EIDS singularity of type $(n+k, n, t)$ in $\mathbb{C}^q$, dim $X = d$. Then*

(i) *For every stratified generic hyperplane H, $X \cap H$ is a $d-1$-dimensional EIDS of the same type in $\mathbb{C}^{q-1}$.*

(ii) *The family of sections $\{X \cap H : H$ is a stratified generic hyperplane for $X\}$ is Whitney equisingular.*

Proof. (i) is Theorem 4.2 in [1]

(ii) follows from the above Proposition and Corollary 2.18. □

Example 2.23. *Let $X = M^{-1}(\Sigma^2)$, where*

$$\begin{array}{rccc} M\colon & \mathbb{C}^6 & \to & Hom(\mathbb{C}^2, \mathbb{C}^3) \\ & (x,y) & \mapsto & \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & x_3 \\ x_4 & x_5 & x_1 + y^{k+1} \end{pmatrix}, \end{array}$$

These are corank one determinantal varieties of type $(3,2,2)$. From Proposition 11.5 in [2] it follows that $\tilde{\chi}(X,0) = -\mu(y^{k+1}) = -k$. These singularities also appear in Theorem 3.6 of [5]. They are listed as type Ω_k.

The relevant equations from Proposition 2.6 are:

$$\chi(X,0) - \chi(X \cap H) = -m_0({}_1X, 0) + m_4(X,0)$$

and

$$m_0({}_1X, 0) = \chi({}_1X, 0)$$

The stratum $({}_1X, 0)$ is a 0-dimensional ICIS of type A_k, so that $m_0({}_1X, 0) = \mu(g) + 1$, $\mu(g) = k$. Then, we get $m_4(X,0) = -\mu(g) + 1 + \mu(g) + 1 - \chi(X \cap H)$, so

$$m_4(X,0) = 2 - \chi(X \cap H).$$

We can now use the calculations in [6], to find that $\chi(X \cap H) = 2$. Specifically, $X \cap H$ is of the same type as the first singularity in the table in section 5. Thus, $m_4(X,0) = 0$

The equation $m_4(X,0) = 0$ can also be deduced from the integral closure machinery. We have that $\overline{M(\mathbb{C}^6) \cdot \Gamma_4(\Sigma^2)} = 0$, since the polar variety of Σ^2 of codimension 4 is empty. Further we can see that $\overline{JM(X)} = \overline{N(X)}$ for this singularity, as follows. Let $G\colon Hom(2,3) \to \mathbb{C}^3$ be the map whose components are the maximal minors, so $\Sigma^2 = G^{-1}(0)$. Apply the chain rule to find $D(G \circ M)$. Then $DG(M)$ is the matrix of generators of $N(X)$ since N is stable. Consider the ideal sheaf induced on $\operatorname{Projan}\mathcal{R}(N(X))$ by the module with matrix DM. Denote it $\mathcal{M}$. Now $\operatorname{Projan}\mathcal{R}(N(X)) \subset X \times \mathbb{P}^5$, use coordinates $T_{i,j}$ for $\mathbb{P}^5$, $1 \leq i \leq 3, 1 \leq j \leq 2$. Then in degree 1, $\mathcal{M}$ is generated by $\{T_{1,1} + T_{3,2}, T_{i,j}, y^k T_{3,2}\}$, where $(i,j) \neq (1,1)$ or $(3,2)$. We have $V(\mathcal{M})$ consists of points of the form $((x,0),[-1,0,\ldots,1])$. On the other hand the fiber of $\operatorname{Projan}\mathcal{R}(N(X))$ over 0 in X consists of the projectivisation of the matrices of rank 1 ([12]), so $V(\mathcal{M})$ misses this fiber. This implies that $\overline{JM(X)} = \overline{N(X)}$ so $e(JM(X), N(X)) = 0$. Hence, $m_4(X) = 0$, which checks the computation from the topological side.

This example provides some insight into what makes a generic presentation matrix; the ideal induced from the derivative of the presentation matrix should not vanish on the fiber of $\operatorname{Projan}\mathcal{R}(N(X))$ over the origin.

The first step to compute the multiplicity of the pair $(JM(X), N(X))$ using intersection theory is to write the generators of $JM(X)$ in terms of the generators of $N(X)$ ([13]). As our remarks above show, in the determinantal setting, the chain rule provides a natural way to do this, showing how DM enters into the computation of $e(JM(X), N(X))$. Since DM plays an important role in the Mather-Damon theory of sections of varieties, this is a promising connection between the two theories.

References

[1] J.-P. Brasselet, N. Chachapoyas and M. A. S. Ruas, *Generic sections of essentially isolated determinantal singularities*, arXiv:1504.06518v1.

[2] J. Damon, B. Pike, *Solvable groups, free divisors and nonisolated matrix singularities II: Vanishing topology.* Geometry and Topology, 18 (2014) 911–962.

[3] W. Ebeling, S. M. Gusein-Zade, Radial index and Euler obstruction of a 1-form on a singular variety. Geometriae Dedicata **113**, 231–241 (2005).

[4] W. Ebeling, S. M. Gusein-Zade, *On the indices of 1-forms on determinantal singularities*, (Russian) Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova 267 (2009), Osobennosti i Prilozheniya, 119–131; translation in Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. 267 (2009), no. 1, 113–124 .

[5] Frühbis-Krüger, A., Neumer, A., *Simple Cohen-Macaulay codimension 2 singularities.* Comm. Algebra 38 (2010), no. 2, 454-495.

[6] A. Frübhis-Krüger, M. Zach, *On the Vanishing Topology of Isolated Cohen-Macaulay Codimension 2 Singularities*

[7] T. Gaffney, *Aureoles and integral closure of modules,* Stratifications, Singularities and Differential Equations II(1997) Herman, Travaux en Cours #55. p55-62

[8] T. Gaffney, *Polar Multiplicities and Equisingularity of Map Germs* Topology 32,(1993), 185–223

[9] T. Gaffney, *Integral closure of modules and Whitney equisingularity,* Inventiones, 107 (1992) 301–22.

[10] T. Gaffney, *The Multiplicity polar theorem*, arXiv:math/0703650v1 [math.CV].

[11] T. Gaffney, *Polar methods, invariants of pairs of modules and equisingularity*, Real and Complex Singularities (São Carlos, 2002), Ed. T. Gaffney and M. Ruas, Contemp. Math., 354, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, June (2004), 113–136.

[12] T.Gaffney, A. Rangachev, *Pairs of modules and determinantal isolated singularities* MathArxiv 1501.00201.

[13] S. Kleiman and A. Thorup, *A geometric theory of the Buchsbaum-Rim multiplicity*, J. Algebra 167 (1994), 168–231.

[14] J. J. Nuño Ballesteros, B. Oréfice Okamoto, J. N. Tomazella, *The vanishing Euler characteristic of an isolated determinantal singularity*, Israel J. Math. 197 (2013) no. 1, 475–495.

[15] M.A.S. Ruas, M. da Silva Pereira, *Codimension two determinantal varieties with isolated singularities*, Math. Scand. 115 (2014), no. 2, 161–172.

[16] B. Teissier, *Cycles évanescents, sections planes et conditions de Whitney,* in "Singularités à Cargèse," Astérisque **7–8** (1973), 285–362.

T. Gaffney, Department of Mathematics, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02215, t.gaffney@neu.edu

M. A. Ruas, Instituto de Ciências Matemáticas e de Computação - USP, Av. Trabalhador são-carlense, 400 - Centro, CEP: 13566-590 - São Carlos - SP, Brazil, maasruas@icmc.usp.br